

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed July 5, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 15, 16, 20, 24 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0027888 to Juskiewicz; rejected claims 2-4, 14, 21-23 and 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Juskiewicz in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0035471 to Pitsoulakis; rejected claims 5, 6, 12 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Juskiewicz and Pitsoulakis in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0204611 to McCosh; rejected claims 8 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Juskiewicz, Pitsoulakis, McCosh in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,754,622 to Beser; rejection claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Juskiewicz, Pitsoulakis, McCosh in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,507,869 to Franke et al.; rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Juskiewicz, Pitsoulakis, McCosh, Franke and Beser; rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Juskiewicz, Pitsoulakis, McCosh, Franke in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0093619 to Cox; rejected claims 17, 18 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Juskiewicz in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/013913 to Shen and rejected claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Juskiewicz in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,760,767 to Miesbauer.

In response, Applicant has amended claims 26 and 27 and cancelled claims 20-25 and 28-30. No new matter has been added.

Applicant has amended claims 26 and 27 to recite a computer readable medium that stores a program. Applicant asserts that this claim is directed to an apparatus and is therefore patentable subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

In rejecting claims 1 and 26, the Examiner asserts that Juskiewicz teaches “determining status of a network connection on a physical data link between said home network and said network.” This is incorrect. Claims 1 and 26 recite determining the status of a network connection between TWO networks. Juskiewicz does describe providing a status indication between a network and a consumer electronic device (CED) such as an audio receiver, a CD player, a DVD player or a set of speakers. See paragraph [0423]. Juskiewicz fails to mention determining a status between two networks.

Claims not specifically mentioned above are allowable due to their dependence on an allowed claim.

CONCLUSION

No additional fees are due for this response. However, the Office is authorized to charge any additional fees or underpayments of fees (including fees for petitions for extensions of time) under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 and 1.17 to account number 502117. Any overpayments should be credited to the same account.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application, withdrawal of the rejections made in the last Office Action and the issuance of a Notice of Allowance. The Applicant's representative can be reached at the below telephone number if the Examiner has any questions.

Respectfully submitted,

Zheng Fang et al.

____/Benjamin D. Driscoll/_____
Benjamin D. Driscoll
Reg. No. 41,571
Motorola, Inc.
101 Tournament Drive
Horsham, PA 19044
P (215) 323-1840
F (215) 323-1300

____October 5, 2007____
Date